UNITY

FREEDOM, FELLOWSHIP AND CHARACTER IN RELIGION

The Church of Tomorrow - *Kenneth L. Patton*

Adlerian Psychology and the Teaching of Jesus - - - *Palmer Van Gundy*

Is Conscience Anti-Social? - *Wendell Thomas*

The Changing Vista of Religion - - - - - - *F. H. Amphlett Micklewright*

Road to Moscow - - *O. A. Hammand*

TRUMPETS ON NEW HORIZONS
Edited by Lucia Trent

VOLUME CXXVIII NUMBER 11

Chicago, January, 1943

PRICE FIFTEEN CENTS

UNITY

Established 1878

(Jenkin Lloyd Jones, Editor, 1880-1918)

Published Monthly *Subscription $1.50*
Until Further Notice *Single Copies 15 cents*

Published by The Abraham Lincoln Centre, 700 Oakwood Blvd., Chicago, Ill.

"Entered as Second-Class Matter, April 11, 1941, at the Post Office at Chicago, Illinois, under Act of March 3, 1879."

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES, *Editor* CURTIS W. REESE, *Managing Editor*

Contributors

O. A. Hammand: Attorney at law and free lance writer.

F. H. Amphlett Micklewright: Minister of The Unitarian Church of The Saviour, Southampton, England.

Kenneth L. Patton: Minister of the First Unitarian Society of Madison, Wisconsin.

Wendell Thomas: Member of the Religious Society of Friends; author of *Hinduism Invades America* and *A Democratic Philosophy.*

Palmer Van Gundy: Contributor to various musical journals, author of juvenile fiction, and formerly a music critic on the staff of the *Hollywood Citizen-News.*

Contents

EDITORIAL—
Editorial Comments—JOHN HAYNES HOLMES....163
Jottings—JOHN HAYNES HOLMES....165

ARTICLES—
The Church of Tomorrow—KENNETH L. PATTON....166
Adlerian Psychology and the Teaching of Jesus—PALMER VAN GUNDY....169
Is Conscience Anti-Social?—WENDELL THOMAS....170
The Changing Vista of Religion—F. H. AMPHLETT MICKLEWRIGHT....172
Road to Moscow—O. A. HAMMAND....174

POETRY—
Storm Over Europe—CLEM GRAHAM....168
The New "New Year"—HELEN KIMBERLY MCELHONE....173
The Vision of the Oneness—VICTOR E. SOUTHWORTH....176

TRUMPETS ON NEW HORIZONS—
Dawn Comes Slowly—IDA ELAINE JAMES....171
When Shall Eternal Eden Spring to Birth?—IRENE KIRBY SURENSON....171
Erosion—DELLA ADAMS LEITNER....171
Under the Curse—CLAUDE WEIMER....171

STUDY TABLE—
Handbook of Private Schools—JOHN HAYNES HOLMES....175
A Growing Book—ETTA JOSEPHEAN MURFEY....175
Memorable Poems—JOHN HAYNES HOLMES....176

THE FIELD—
Jewish Commonwealth in Holy Land....162

The Field

"The world is my country, to do good is my Religion."

Jewish Commonwealth in Holy Land

Declaring that "the destiny of the Jews is a matter of immediate concern to the Christian conscience" and the amelioration of their lot "a duty which rests upon all who profess Christian principles," the representatives of almost 500 Christian leaders, clergymen and laymen of all denominations throughout the country, after an all-day conference held at the Hotel Pennsylvania in New York on Monday, December 14, 1942, organized themselves as the Christian Council on Palestine, and adopted a Statement of Principles which pointed out that "of all lands available for the mass migration of Jews in the post-war world, Palestine is the most practicable."

To implement the Statement of Principles the newly formed Council sets forth as its policy the following:

1. The Council is committed to the establishment of a Jewish commonwealth in Palestine in relation to an overall settlement of the problem of Jewish migration in the post-war era.

2. The Council is committed to press for the establishment of a Jewish commonwealth in Palestine within such a framework and proposes:

(a) To disseminate among Christians throughout the land information concerning the present nature of the Jewish problem, particularly in Nazi-subjugated lands, and to arouse the concern of Christians in America over this problem;

(b) To win Christian organizations to the support of the objectives of the Council;

(c) To present the views and convictions of the Council to religious, social, political, and diplomatic agencies regarded as helpful to its objectives.

3. In view of the new wave of savagery against all Jews in Europe instituted by Hitler, and its cruel repercussions, the Council urges as an immediate policy the admission now of Jewish exiles into other countries, including the United States, as well as Palestine on the terms dictated by humane considerations for suffering and homeless exiles, prevailing in all civilized nations.

The principal speakers at the conference were Prof. Reinhold Niebuhr of the Union Theological Seminary of New York, Bishop Francis John McConnell of the New York Methodist Area, and Prof. S. Ralph Harlow of Smith College, Northampton, Mass. Other speakers at the conference were Rabbi Stephen S. Wise, Chairman of the American Emergency Committee for Zionist Affairs, and Mrs. Walter C. Lowdermilk of Washington, D. C., who, together with her husband who is Assistant Chief Soil Conservation Expert of the United States Department of Agriculture, made a study of the soil reclamation work done in Palestine by Jewish colonists.

UNITY

"He Hath Made of One All Nations of Men"

Volume CXXVIII JANUARY, 1943 No. 11

Editorial Comments

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES

I

As the old year passes into the new, I can think of no more wholesome thing for us to do than to ponder the sensational speech made by Pearl Buck on the occasion of the Nobel Prize Winners dinner in New York this past month (December 10th). Miss Buck came out flatfooted with the declaration that this war "has ceased to be a fight for freedom." The only exception one can take to this remark, it seems to me, is that this war never was "a fight for freedom" in Miss Buck's sense of the word. It is not even "a war to save civilization," she continued, "but only a war to save European civilization." The real cause of freedom and of civilization, as Miss Buck explained, involves the entire world—Asia and Africa, as well as Europe. But we do not see this. It is contrary to our interest to see it. So "the people of Asia," says Miss Buck, "are further from us today than they have ever been. They are realizing soberly that they must find their salvation in themselves. . . . After this war is won, there will be another war, a greater war, a real war for freedom, in which none of us sees clearly either friend or foe. It is not now so certain what this war will gain us. Perhaps it will not even save civilization for us. For it is in wars that civilizations are lost, if they go on too long. Then Miss Buck continues —and ponder this well:

> What we must foresee is that unless there is a miracle, we will have to fight another war to save freedom. There was no miracle a year ago [when we were hoping that we could stay out of this war]—there is no reason to hope for one now.
>
> Somewhere in this year the step might have been taken which could have averted this fate. Until that moment this war was being fought as a war for freedom. Could there have been a man great enough at that significant moment to have declared that this war was a war for freedom of all peoples, we would not have had to face now, as we do face, another war of which this one is only the beginning.
>
> One can only hope at most, now, that there will be a breathing space between this war and the next. One cannot guarantee that there will be that space.

All this as reported in the New York Times! Is it worth pondering as this old year passes away? I know of no word spoken since this war began that can compare with it in honesty, discernment, and prophetic understanding. The fact that we have Miss Buck to speak this word, and Mr. Willkie to speak his word, is perhaps the "miracle" that may yet save mankind.

II

What Pearl Buck was thinking of in her tremendous Nobel Prize address, which reminds of nothing quite so much as of the great passages of Hebrew prophecy, is revealed in the most cursory survey of recent events. Already the dread business of losing the peace in the winning of the war seems to have started. Thus, no sooner was the great military triumph in North Africa well begun, than it was spoiled, so far as its aim was concerned, by the alliance with Admiral Darlan as the leader of the French cause in that area. But more dangerous, again from the standpoint of the peace, is Winston Churchill's growing intransigence. As the prospect brightens, his stubborn imperialism deepens. What are we to think of his statement that Britain "means to hold [her] own. I have not become the King's first minister in order to preside over the liquidation of the British Empire"? This means, if it means anything, that after this war the British Empire is going to stand intact—that 380,000,000 Indians, for example, are going to remain subject to the British crown. Is this what we are fighting for? The writer of a leading article in the *Progressive* declares that this statement by Churchill is "the worst blow the United Nations have received in this war." It proves, he continues, that "we cannot win this war by beating Hitler; we have got to beat Churchill, too." I am no authority on winning the war. But on winning the peace we are all authorities. We know, as Wendell Willkie and now Pearl Buck have told us, that there can be no peace unless the imperial system is ended, unless the eastern peoples are received into the family of nations, unless freedom is established everywhere. Churchill or no Churchill, these must be our aims, if war, peace, and all else, are not to be lost.

III

They are at it again—these well-intentioned men who are telling us in this war, as they told us so elo-

quently in the last war, that the fighting is bringing us a great spiritual revival. Governor Lehman, of New York, is the latest public leader to indulge in this pleasant fantasy. As a result of the impacts and sacrifices of the war, says Mr. Lehman, "the American people are experiencing a profound spiritual renaissance that will effect the future not only of this country but of the world." Now, of course, the logic of this argument, if based upon reality, is that war is a good thing and should be perpetuated. For there is nothing in life more precious than the spirit, and if this can be revived and purified by resort to arms, then we ought to have a war every generation or so. "The slow decay which threatened our civilization has given way to a new vigor," says Mr. Lehman, which leads him to the startling assertion that "in the appalling events of our time we can recognize the guiding hand of Providence." If this be true, then Providence is surely moving "in a mysterious way, its wonders to perform." For this providential remedy for "slow decay" strikes me for all the world like killing a man today so that he may not die of disease tomorrow. But, this point aside, there remains the dreadful conclusion that, if the governor is right, then all these efforts we are making to get rid of war are mistaken. We are simply betraying the race when we are endeavoring to bring out of this war a peace which will last. We don't want such a peace, argues Mr. Lehman in effect, for it would mean inevitably a decadent democracy, a senile society, and a general corruption and decay. For our own moral and spiritual health, we must keep on fighting until we are bled to death, and thus perish gloriously in the full vigor of our mind and soul. This is of course absurd, and in its essence unjust to Mr. Lehman, and yet it is the logic of his remarks. But all this is based upon the premise that it is true that war brings a spiritual renaissance! As a matter of fact this premise of the governor is as dubious as his conclusion. War brings us no spiritual renaissance. The coming of such a renaissance was ecstatically proclaimed in the last war, and we were all on the tiptoe of expectation. But it never came! On the contrary, the last war was followed by a period of utter moral degeneration which largely explains the coming of this present war. In the same way, the Civil War, which was an idealistic war if there ever was one, was followed by the most corruptly degrading period in American history. Bishop McConnell states that, after this war, we shall have to face "a revival of materialism" and "a decline in morality." This is realism!

IV

The realism referred to in the above editorial is a thing to face without flinching if we are not to fall into ruin as a sheer result of self-deception. This realism has received two remarkable statements of late. One is by Bishop Francis J. McConnell, just quoted, and appears in a newly published volume entitled *A Basis for the Peace to Come*—a symposium to which the Bishop contributes the opening essay. Assuming the defeat of the Axis powers, the Bishop declares that after the war there will be "widespread [and] almost universal impoverishment," hunger, unemployment, "a revival of materialism," and "a decline of morality." "Nobody need be taken by surprise by [these conditions]," he writes. "The entire situation will present a challenge to the Christian Church." The second statement appears in an article in the December issue of *Harper's Magazine*, by Hiram Motherwell, a distinguished American journalist, formerly European correspondent of the *Chicago Daily News*. Listing what he calls "ugly realities for hopeful peace-planners," Mr. Motherwell speaks first of hunger—"on Armistice Day there will be one universal preoccupation among the peoples of Europe—how can I get something to eat." Second, Europe will see at the close of the war "an appalling proportion of its wealth destroyed." Third, "deterioration of soil will probably average between 25 per cent and 50 per cent throughout the continent." Fourth, there will be widespread "deterioration of machines and equipment." Fifth, there will be an absence of "every conceivable type of civilian consumers' goods." Sixth, the "destruction of human life" and the reduction of "physical and nervous stamina" will be appalling. Seventh, there will be wholesale loss of private property, confusion of land holdings, and financial demoralization. Eighth, there will be universal unemployment. Ninth, there will be chaos and anarchy between "conflicting social classes." And last, in all and through all, such " a volume of hate" as history has never seen before. "Such will be Europe," says Mr. Motherwell, "shattered, impoverished, demoralized." In the light of such realities, how fatal appear such facile statements as those of Governor Lehman, quoted above. And how "up in the air," so to speak, most of the easy-going peace-planning that is now occupying so many minds. Our first job in facing the problem of post-war Europe is to see things as they are, or will be when the war is done. The memory of the last war ought to tell us what this war is doing. But instinctively we turn away from the confession that war is what it is—namely, waste, want, and woe.

V

I was reading the other night of the struggle of the German armies to reach the Volga, and got thinking of the role that rivers play in history. The Nile, for example! This river was the center of the oldest, and for centuries the most powerful, civilization in history. To understand Egypt, one must understand the Nile. The two are inextricably entangled together. Of the significance and wonder of this river, Emil Ludwig has told much in his book, *The Nile*. Or take the Ganges, which flows like the lifeblood of Indian life! Dam up this stream, and India would straightway be-

come paralyzed or dead. It would be interesting to see somebody try to tell the story of England without mentioning the Thames. And what could one do with Europe without the Rhine and the Danube? Rivers in America have always been of central importance. The Mississippi, from De Soto and La Salle to Mark Twain, has been like a pattern-thread in the texture of our history. Think of the place of the Mississippi in the vast drama of the Civil War, and you have the picture. Smaller rivers also have been important. Remember what Henry David Thoreau did with the Concord and the Merrimac! Which brings us 'round to where we started—with the Volga River in Russia! It is told of a Russian peasant that a fellow villager expressed dismay at the prospect of Hitler breaking through to the Volga and cutting Russia's "life-line," as it has been called. "Never," cried this peasant; "Volga is our Mother, and no enemy will ever touch her." So it seems, as the terrific war in Russia goes on. Why can't Hitler make those last few miles, or even rods, to the river? Is there something mystical in the waters of that stream? Yes, in the sense that for ages its mighty flow from north to south has conveyed something mystical to the Russian heart. Had Hitler any spiritual imagination in him, he would have understood and anticipated this mystical element which makes Russia unconquerable. It isn't the winter, as we are so often told. Napoleon in 1812 was beaten and in full retreat before the winter set in at all; Hitler survived the winter of 1941-42. No, there is something deeper and infinitely more potent than weather. It is the spirit here at work—that spirit of valor and devotion, and a sacred destiny of which the Volga is the symbol. This river is to the Russian a sacrament—"the outward and visible sign of an inward and spiritual grace." Hence the triumphs of this hour!

VI

It is a satisfaction at last to read a statement in tribute to the churches of Europe for what they have done in resistance to Nazi tyranny. As a matter of fact, it is the churches which have alone stood fast in opposition to the Fuehrer and all his works. The generals, the politicians, the Socialists, the trade unionists, the Masons, have all either surrendered or run away, but the churches have held their ground, and obeyed God rather than men. Now we get recognition of this high service of truth and freedom in Dr. William Paton's essay in the new book, *A Basis for the Peace to Come*. "The importance and relevance of the Christian church in Europe today" is a matter of prime significance, writes Dr. Paton. "In Norway," for example, "the church has become the very center of national resistance." Its stand has been "a stand against the reign of injustice and the denial of elementary rights to the ordinary man." In Holland, the churches have led the fight against the baleful rule of Nazi anti-Semitism, and thus "have moved into the center of Dutch national life." In France it is the church which ignored the dividing line between occupied and unoccupied France, and therewith maintained the unity of French consciousness. Now that France has fallen completely under the domination of the conqueror, we may be sure that the church will single-handedly perpetuate the integrity of the nation's life. But it is in Germany itself that the churches, both Catholic and Protestant, have done their noblest and bravest work. Niemoeller and Faulhaber are already sacred names which serve as symbols of the power of religion in the hour of extremity. "Protests have been and are being made," writes Dr. Paton, "in the name of Christian truth and the life of the church, against the denial of justice, against euthanasia, and against other manifestations of a tyrannical and anti-Christian temper. No braver protests have been made anywhere in the world . . . against iniquity in the life of the state than by the Roman Catholic Bishop of Münster, Count von Galen, or by the Protestant Bishop Würm of Württemberg." In the face of this evidence of sublime courage and fidelity, I find myself getting sick and tired of all the easy-going reproaches directed against the churches these days. When the record is written and all the story told, it will be found that the churches did more than all the armies to get rid of Adolf Hitler.

Jottings

What is the most beautiful word in the English language? After forty years of speaking and listening, I think the most beautiful word is *"Lastly."*

There are a lot of things that I am worrying about these days, but the limitation of salaries to a top maximum of $25,000 is not one of them.

A newspaper columnist urges this country to use Nazi methods in this war. "If Hitler is a Machiavelli," he writes, "why shouldn't Roosevelt be one, too?"

I can't think of a single reason—except that native sense of decency and honor which, among many other worthy things, distinguishes the President from the Fuehrer.

In his new volume of speeches, entitled *The Unrelenting Struggle,* Mr. Winston Churchill speaks of "all

the infamies of Darlan and of Laval."

Having made the infamous Darlan our ally in North Africa, will we make the infamous Laval our ally when we get to France?

It seems generally agreed that the one limitation on civil liberties in wartime is what Mr. Justice Holmes called "clear and present danger" to the state. But let it be never forgotten that this danger must be "clear" —and it must be *"present"*!

A few days after the publication of this issue of UNITY, Gandhi will have been in prison five months. Is his imprisonment going to run on indefinitely, like that of Martin Niemoeller?

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES.

The Church of Tomorrow*

KENNETH L. PATTON

The days ahead will not be easy days for churches, or ministers, or any people with deep religious ideals. The times of crisis and change—war, depression, economic and social revolution—these are hard days for institutions. It is in periods like these that new institutions are born and the outmoded organizations of society are sloughed off.

The church as a functioning institution suffers from the same malady as words. We may have a new conception of the function of the church, but to the average person the church will continue to mean much the same as it has meant in the past. Institutions, like words, cannot be taken abruptly out of their historical contexts without confusion and misunderstanding. Drastic redefinitions of a word or of an institution demand just as drastic reorientation and reëducation in ways of thinking and feeling toward the word or institution. Many things conspire to make this reorientation inadequate.

The worst difficulty derives from the fact that the church continues to stand for the old authoritarianism and supernaturalism in the practice and thinking of the larger part of the populace. To the great mass a church is a church and a religion a religion. We find it hard to unlearn ideas and alter feeling patterns. That which was learned at mother's knee sticks to the ribs and often the nervous system says *yes* when a man's mind says *no*. We can sing a lot of theology that we cannot preach or practice.

The reason the church persists is that it still occupies the same general place in our lives today that it assumed in the lives of our ancestors. But our needs, our hopes, aspirations, and beliefs have changed. It fills at the same time the same need and a different need, for man and his culture have changed and evolved. We are of the past but not in the past. The church should conserve the old and worthy values, but it should also be a challenger and forerunner, a lamp set on a hill, not the great stronghold of dying ideas and the darling handmaiden of vested interests.

The Christian Church, from which the church of tomorrow is growing, is an adaptation of the Jewish Synagogue. The pattern of our services, the setting aside of the sabbath, the readings and preachings, the singing, the meditations and prayers are very similar. The idea of the church as the center of the community has been somewhat lost, and the identity of the church as the state is no longer desired. Nor is the church held commonly to be a stronghold of racial and national unity. But we surely desire the church to carry over some of the social significance it held for the Jewish people.

What would we carry over from the role of the church as it is interpreted by the Catholic and Episcopalian bodies? The answer is, nothing; nothing that is held as the peculiar differences of the church from worldly institutions. We cannot subscribe to the Catholic God, nor to salvation as they interpret it, nor to a dogmatic belief in eternal life and the machinery of the church to win immortality for its members, nor the infallibility and divinity of the Bible, nor the efficacy of the sacraments. The realm of supernature which has been the province of the church has ceased to exist for us, and therefore we must seek a role for the church to play in a completely natural world.

The Protestant churches are more congenial to us because of their more democratic spirit illustrated in the priesthood of all believers and the status of the minister as the servant rather than lord. The idea of the church as a democratic fellowship, a community of mutual friendliness and helpfulness is the seed of the church of tomorrow. It was largely this freedom and individuality in the Protestant movement that allowed the development of the Unitarians and even Humanism within their midst, whereas, in the Catholic Church, such movements are nipped in the bud and removed from the body of the faithful.

The modernist Protestant churches are an intermediary stage between the orthodoxy of the past and freedom of tomorrow. They are intelligent, socially minded, liberal in many directions, but basically true to the creeds of orthodoxy. The main appeal of modernism lies in its attitude of personal loyalty to the historic Jesus and the church he founded. The Bible becomes a social-historical record of man's spiritual growth and their God is the God of creativity and the forces producing personality. But the modernist is in the position of the circus performer who is trying to ride two horses at once which do not want to stay together. He insists that Jesus was a man, but somehow he still trails clouds of divine glory. Their God is but the sickly ghost of the "he-man" gods of the past, but they cannot do without him. Their conception of the church is likewise in the hazy mid-region between Humanism and orthodoxy. They have gone a long way toward the final liberation of the human spirit, but the horse has balked at jumping the last fence.

Our horse got over the fence, and that makes all the difference. All others are still within the old tradition, more or less; we stand for a new tradition being born

*An address recently delivered in the pulpit of the First Unitarian Society of Madison, Wisconsin.

which shall be above all the provincial traditions of the past. I can no longer feel myself as a part of any single tradition, except that of the growing unity and common brotherhood of the entire human race.

Many people are asking if the church has any role at all to play in the world in face of all this. If there is no God as of old we do not need the church as mediator; if no salvation, then no need of a church to save us; if no eternal life, then no need of the sacraments. All this is true. The church cannot continue to exist on the pretensions of the past. Institutions arise to fill certain definite needs; they die when those needs are filled or cease to exist. Either that, or they readapt themselves to meet new needs that have arisen. The crisis that faces the church in its role in the world today is precisely whether it has the flexibility and resiliency to grow and change, and whether or not it is capable of successfully ministering to the vital needs of men in some capacity peculiar to its singular genius and character.

Many people have decided they do not need a church. We might question whether their life might not be richer with a church fellowship. If it cannot, then it means they have found an adequate substitute in some other relationship or organization, and it has become, shall we say, their church. This is entirely possible. There is no law that a church must have one type of organization or setup. I believe that what has happened is that other groups have partially served the function of the church in their lives, but that an adequate church fellowship could serve them more completely and better.

What is the peculiar genius and character of the church? Just this: it is the only institution concerned with the total life of the individual and the total life of the human community. In the totalitarian countries the state has assumed this function, and it has become a religion in the process, for a man's religion consists of his conceptions of the meanings, ends, and purposes of life. Our insistence on the separation of the church and the state is based on our belief that only in a man's religion is the totality of life interpreted, and that this is the province of the church of a man's free choice and it cannot be imposed upon him by the state.

Men today are torn apart by the variant demands and influences of this inconsistent and complex world. All too often we are a dozen men in a dozen different environments. We need some force to make life coherent and integrated, to synthesize and make consistent the forces of our character and personality. This is to be found adequately only in the church or some institution which adequately replaces the church. There is no such institution that I know of. The home is too transitory and too fortuitous. It is broken by death and time. The school is fashioned to serve only a few years of our lives. All other institutions are specialized. They take care of a man's finances, his health, his real estate, put out his fires, provide a place for discussion, or recreation. The factory provides a living and a job. The lodge takes but a corner of our life and loyalty. The government provides us with services and protections. But where is the institution concerned with the whole man, his whole life, and the whole life of his society? Only the church even assumes such a role.

As we look over the many types of churches in our towns and cities, it is all too evident that rarely does the church measure up to this ideal. It seems that the main difficulty lies in the artificial relation of the church to its community and the people it serves. There are the large preaching stations with a small local congregation scattered over a large city and the Sunday congregation made up mainly of strangers and visitors. There is the church in the big city which depends upon its surrounding neighborhood which has no real community integrity and is heavily transient. In the smaller towns, because of denominational segregation, the church is looked upon as the private concern of its body of believers, and not as the focal point of community coöperation. Even where there is only one church it is usually denominational, and not all men are at home in it. Even in the community church the individuals retain some denominational loyalty which prevents complete effectiveness. In the middle-sized cities we find churches resembling both those in the large cities and the small towns, with a combination of the advantages and disadvantages of both. There are the overgrown churches which resemble smoothly running businesses more than a religious community, and small churches struggling to live at all. Their congregations do not live together, and often see each other only when at church. The church does not grow up out of the needs of a community; it rather attempts to superimpose a community centered in itself upon a disintegrated city population.

I believe that the crucial fault with all these churches lies not in the church itself, but in the inadequacies in the structure of the community of which the church is only one element. A city the size of New York is a sin against human nature; it is an impossible situation. The only thing that saves a human being in such a place is the tendency for the city to break up into innumerable little communities, centering in a drug store, a tenement block, a poolroom, a business firm, a church, or some such gathering place or common interest. These become partial and inadequate expressions of humanity's need for community life. But people tend to be members of several such groups, which often do not intersect at all. They are often different personalities in each community. In small towns there is often real community integrity, but cultural and economic deficiencies and social barriers affect the lives of the members.

The church of tomorrow will come only with the communities of tomorrow. As Arthur E. Morgan maintained in the *Atlantic Monthly* of February, 1942, the community is the seedbed of society. The size and character of the village is most friendly to the development of human personality. There all people know each other and there is family continuity. The basic traits of civilized men, such as good will, neighborliness, courage, tolerance, are fostered in the intimate life of the family which is reinforced by the community life that is scarcely less intimate.

There are many tendencies which indicate that we are headed back to something similar to village life. The breakup of the big city has already begun. Suburban life is becoming more popular, and small residential districts are springing up along the arterial roads leading into the metropolises. Decentralization of shopping and manufacturing areas, ease of transportation and communication, small and efficient public utilities, these and other factors make it likely that we will combine the advantages of country life and smaller communities with the physical comforts and conveniences of the large city. It is possible for the village to have a wholesome, intimate life of its own, and yet

share in all the cultural advantages of the outside world. The cultural advantages of the cities are of an impersonal and spectator nature. One can go to them to acquire possessions, knowledge, entertainment, experiences to take back to the smaller, more meaningful community. There is no reason why anyone should have to live in or near these large centers. These small communities will be designed in the arrangement of houses, parks, playground facilities, community center, schools, libraries, and so forth, for that type of life which will produce the maximum and highest results in personality values. Federal housing projects and architects' visions illustrate the way to intelligent community planning.

The church of tomorrow will be different in many ways from the church of today. There will be only one church in each community. This may sound like heresy to freedom of religion and tolerance; it is not that. It indicates that the church will have to be big enough to include many types of opinion within an undogmatic fellowship. Tolerance and freedom will be within the church rather than between churches. Here the Unitarian ideal of agreement in disagreement leads the way. Only a united and single church can function effectively within the community. This will be a depressingly long time in coming, if it ever does. But certain tendencies justify a long-range optimism. History and science are creating a common denominator to which all religions will have to conform or lose the intelligent populace. The liberal elements of many faiths are already surprisingly close together, and the trend within denominations is toward liberalism.

The one church will not have competition and the weakness of divided forces. This will create many changes within the church and in the attitude of the people toward it. You will not join the church; you will be born into it, as was the villager in medieval Europe. It will be an accepted part of community life. Its beliefs and ideals will seem natural and right. Its undogmatic tenets will permit of creative disagreement when the individual's critical intelligence begins to analyze himself and his world.

Living as we do in a period of drastic transition, we cannot realize what the world was like when almost everybody believed about the same thing. We tend to forget that there have been periods of thousands of years when man's ideas changed very little and there were few basic philosophical disagreements. I believe the present process will resolve itself into a similar equilibrium on a higher level. Until things are more shaken down and equalized we will not have satisfactory communities nor the churches to serve them.

As to the form of the church, my intuition tells me the villages will average around five hundred families with a community center in each village. These centers will be comprised of schools, libraries, utilities and social services, recreational facilities, parks, playgrounds, museums, and such like. There may be a separate building for a church, or it may be the community house, or the community house might have a chapel in it. Worship will not be a segregated function as we now conceive it. It will be associated with the various village functions. The medieval cathedral was used for almost all community functions. The cultural life will be unified as it is not now. Music, painting, poetry, and song will be natural expressions, not performances to select audiences as they are today. The enjoyment of such will not be distinguished from worship. Perhaps there will be an evening service in which poetry will be read, songs sung, music played, and the moral aspirations of the community given noble expression. These may be given every evening, with all the community participating both in attendance and performance. Radio and television will supplement personal attendance, but I believe these will be used sparingly in preference to the benefits of real human association. What we now accept as religious expression and worship is a meagre stopgap. The full richness of man's poetry and devotion are still to be seen.

There may be no ministers such as we have now. There may rather be committees and many community leaders serving many functions. There will be more integration and cooperation between community services than we now experience. Some person in the group will rise to leadership and interpret the philosophy for the whole group. There will remain the need to see the community, the human being, the world, the universe as a whole. There must be poets of life, philosophers, teachers, guides. Each man will be more and more these things for himself. But he will need to listen to his fellows and learn from them, and every man who stands before the group to make the contribution that his special knowledge and experience has befitted him for will be the preacher. The artist and musician and dramatist will likewise lead into new worlds of experience and understanding. The false and arbitrary walls between the arts, religion, and everyday life will dissolve. We will again begin to see ourselves whole, and create communities which will serve the whole man. And some focal, unifying institutional life will develop, and that will be the church of tomorrow.

Thus the community and the church will again become a single entity. There will develop a democratic and creative exchange of ideas, facts, dreams, longings, and affection. The will of the church will be the will of a people freely united, seeking together the common benefits of a good life for all. The church will provide the basic attitudes and idealisms which the community members will make concrete in homes and business and their life together. Man will be one with his neighbors because his hopes and dreams, his goals and beliefs will be common and shared. Within the church and community he will find the shared life, the mutual quest, the common human enterprise.

Storm Over Europe

Out of a brown cloud, out of Germany hissing,
An all-embracing wind of havoc strongly blows
Over a nude charred continent strewn with bodies,
Over the blackened rubble of murdered nations,
Over a Nazi-conquered Europe deep in ruins,
Over the remains of all things of loveliness.

And only yesterday beauty blossomed forth
With all the loveliness of the universe,
Where now the smoking rubble is,
Where now the cities lie in waste,
Where now the countryside is treeless.

CLEM GRAHAM.

Adlerian Psychology and the Teaching of Jesus

PALMER VAN GUNDY

In our generation there has been no greater psychologist than Alfred Adler—certainly none who has had a more constructive influence on the thought of his time. Jewish by birth, Adler adopted the Protestant Christian viewpoint at an early age, and it is in the light of this faith that his work must be considered. When on May 28th, 1937, the founder of Individual Psychology dropped dead on the streets of Aberdeen, Scotland, in the midst of a lecture tour, the world lost the scientist who more than any other had made the teachings of Jesus comprehensible to Science, and the science of psychology understandable and helpful to the ordinary man.

A detailed examination of Adler's contribution to thought is, of course, beyond the scope of the present article. Phyllis Bottome in her excellent biography, *Alfred Adler,* has given a clear and accurate account of his theories, and there are Adler's own books, of which *Understanding Human Nature* is one of the best. But for the reader whose acquaintance with Individual Psychology may be slight or whose impressions of his books may have been dulled by subsequent reading, a brief review of his major ideas may be in order.

To begin with, it should be pointed out that Adler believed strongly in the freedom of the individual, within reasonable limits, to shape his own destiny. In this respect he departed radically from the dogma of determinism which in one form or another had dominated psychological investigations up to his time. Although Adler believed that the life pattern or style of the individual is decided very early in childhood, he always contended that the individual *chooses* this pattern instead of having it forced on him by heredity or environment. Later in life it might be extremely difficult for a person to change his habits of thought, both conscious and unconscious, but according to Adler this was always possible with adequate professional assistance even in the most advanced delinquency and maladjustment. Thus he affirmed the Christian belief in responsibility for sin and the power to overcome it.

Adlerian psychology also coincides with the teachings of Jesus in its emphasis on the need for unselfish living and social interest. Our Lord taught that a man should love his neighbor as himself and that on this precept rested the whole law and the gospel. Adler said:

> We can judge a character as bad or good only from the standpoint of society. Character, just as any achievement in science, politics, or art, becomes noteworthy only when it has proven its universal value. The criteria by which we can measure an individual are determined by his value to mankind in general.

This stressing of social interest as paramount is the distinguishing feature of Individual Psychology.

That Adler should have chosen the term "individual" to describe his system of thought affords an interesting paradox. No psychology is less individual than his in the sense of providing an escape from the problems of communal living and responsibility to other people. But his psychology is individual in the sense that, unlike many other systems, it aims to treat the whole person rather than any one or more of his parts alone. Adler always maintained that it was not just the heart, or the glands, or the early environment, or the later environment, or the heredity, or any other single factor that was primarily responsible for the patient's difficulties, but rather a wrong orientation of the personality as a whole. This does not mean that he overlooked the value of medicine and surgery—he, in fact, made noteworthy contributions to the science of medicine—but merely that he viewed all disorder as involving the whole individual rather than its parts alone. Thus, like that of Jesus, his psychology was a psychology of personality. And it was because of his belief in the supreme worth of personality that he accepted the Master's principle of loving one's neighbor as oneself.

Adler taught that a great deal of the trouble which besets the individual in his psychic life is caused by his failure to meet squarely life's responsibilities. There are, according to Adler, three main tasks or problems which confront each person, and it is by the manner in which these problems are handled that the person must be judged. These are the problems of social contacts or one's relations to other people, the problem of vocation or one's work in life, and the problem of love and marriage. No one, Adler contended, can evade any of these responsibilities and remain a complete individual.

When an attempt is made to evade them, some form of psychic abnormality invariably results. The misanthrope tries to find happiness by avoiding his obligations to other people, and inevitably finds his world growing smaller and less satisfying. The loafer refuses to do his share of useful work, and thus loses the ability to provide for his own basic needs. The sex pervert is merely an extreme case of one who has refused the responsibilities of marriage and parenthood. No one can escape the necessity of facing life's demands.

It was Alfred Adler, more than anyone else in modern psychiatry, who brought to light the "inferiority feeling" with its tremendous influence for good or bad. In fact, for all practical purposes, he may be credited with the creation of the term itself, although others before him may have used it without his insight into its true meaning and significance.

Each of us, Adler believed, has at one time or other the feeling of inferiority. This is the natural result of the manner by which we come into the world and of our own littleness in a large and terrifying universe. The normal personality succeeds in throwing off the feeling of inferiority to a considerable extent, although a certain sense of it remains as a spur to worthy achievement. But to one who fails to overcome it, it may become the most terrible of bugaboos, a stultifying thing which paralyzes all effort and renders life unhappy and barren. Or to compensate for it, the individual may develop an abnormal feeling of superiority which manifests itself in what Adler chose to call the "useless side of life." Mild expressions of this are boastfulness and the tendency to monopolize the conversation; more extreme forms are delusions of grandeur and the desire to conquer the world.

The whole secret of the proper handling of the inferiority feeling, according to the tenets of Adlerian psychology, is in finding a way to compensate for it on the useful rather than the useless side of life. What is of service to humanity is of value; what is of no service to humanity cannot in the ultimate sense be justified. This is the key to Adler's teaching. It is the key also to the solution of the world's problems, both in-

dividual and collective.

It may be objected that Alfred Adler's remedy is too exacting, too difficult—that it is beyond the accomplishment of all save saints and martyrs. If Adler were merely an ethical idealist, this objection might be valid. But Adler was more than an ethical idealist; he was a Christian. He accepted Jesus' belief in the ultimate triumph of the human soul. He shared Jesus' trust in God, from which springs the courage to face life in even its most desperate issues and come out victorious.

Is Conscience Anti-Social?

WENDELL THOMAS

Speaking at a Friends Meeting House in New York recently, Carl J. Hambro warned his audience to beware of the man who declares, "I am responsible only to God and my conscience!" Mr. Hambro, who is President of the Assembly of the League of Nations, properly advocates *social* responsibility, the reciprocal obligations of men to men on which civilization depends. Yet his warning must have raised uneasy questions in the minds of his hearers, for Quakers and other Protestants have been taught that one's responsibility is precisely to God or to conscience. How shall we reconcile one's responsibility to men with sole responsibility to God? And where does conscience come in?

If we believe in the God of Jesus—in an all-good and all-powerful individual—there is no serious problem. For sole responsibility to such a God carries with it an ethical responsibility to men. The same God who commands us to love him with all our being commands us to love men and obey the moral law to the last detail of social responsibility. When I affirm, as a Christian, that I am responsible only to God, I do not deny my responsibility to men; I include the broad realm of social obligation in devotion to a God concerned with moral and political order.

As a Christian, however, one may indeed deny responsibility to men or laws that flout God's commands and violate genuine civilization. In this sense, the declaration of responsibility only to God has a militant meaning. It becomes the battlecry of the Christian who fights dictatorship and the slave state. Martin Luther has taught us that even one lone Christian may speak in the name of God against an ecclesiastical or political body; and the valiant struggles of the church in Norway and elsewhere against Nazi oppression have further glorified the Protestant dictum of responsibility only to God.

Sole responsibility to the God of Jesus is thus the very foundation of social responsibility in peace or in war. It inspires us to share the labor of good government and to resist bad government. But what about conscience? One's conscience, as we know from history, may be theistic or atheistic, legal-minded or antinomian. A man who speaks in the name of God, as does Hitler, may have a conscience so warped that its dictates are in the broad sense anti-social. Pertinent here is Hambro's warning against the man who declares, "I am responsible only to God and my conscience!" Even one who professes Christianity may have anti-social or at least unsocial attitudes if he relies on his private conscience in place of Christian or democratic tradition.

Is conscience, then, a delusion? Should we forget it and think only of God? The difficulty is that we do not all think of God in the same way. Christians may differ among themselves concerning God and divine commands in the political field here and now. Non-Christians may differ from Christians, non-believers from believers in God. Yet each of us has a conscience which serves as his practical absolute. In the realm of common affairs we thus tend to refer to conscience rather than to God when we talk of supreme moral decisions. Conscience is a useful and necessary concept. We need it as we need the term God.

What, then, should we consider to be the relation between God and conscience? From the religious standpoint, God must be more important than conscience; but from the secular standpoint, conscience is presumably more important than God, for God's existence—to the conventional secular mind—is rather doubtful. This disparity is merely one instance of the age-long dualism between the religious and the secular which has baffled thinking on political and other problems. Perhaps we cannot solve the problem of God and conscience without overcoming our traditional dualism.

The very reference to "God and my conscience," as though they were two things, implies the dualistic view that Descartes bequeathed to the modern age. Out there was the material world; within man, the immaterial soul and conscience—a dualism between the material and the immaterial. Above man and the world resided an immaterial God—a dualism between God and man. Present reflection may suggest that a thoroughly non-dualistic view would posit God as the all-embracing eternal *whole* of which the world and its human organisms are temporal expressions.

Suppose, then, we conceive God as the boundless indivisible (that is, individual) whole—not immaterial but material in the sense of being the world's source and stuff as well as its universal good and creator. Every man would be regarded as God in a particular human form, and any man's conscience as God making judgments through a particular human view. Since views interpenetrate, there could be social views, group consciences. Thus the Nazis would have one kind of conscience, the Lutheran church another; pacifists one kind, non-pacifists another. Depending on various circumstances and attitudes, conscience would more or less reveal, more or less hide, the divine goodness and power.

According to this position, conscience and God are not two different things, one secular and the other religious, or one a matter of fact and the other a matter of faith. Conscience *is* God, but God expressed through the relative view of the human organism or group under consideration. In conscience thus understood we have a test for social responsibility.

If a man says, "I am responsible only to God and my conscience," his words are confusing and may possibly indicate a lack of social responsibility, as Carl Hambro suggests. We should therefore turn to more definite statements. If a man says, "I am responsible only to

God," he is socially responsible, provided the God he conceives is social-minded. But if he says, "I am responsible only to my conscience," he is not socially responsible, no matter how benevolent his conscience may be. For one's private conscience is not ultimate or self-sufficient. It is precisely that which forever needs correction through other consciences in our ceaseless movement toward the God of all. We should be responsible not to our several consciences but to God *through* them. In sum, conscience is not final but instrumental.

The old-fashioned notion of conscience as an isolated human thing will disappear with the collapse of the dualism between God and man; but in non-dualistic theism conscience may be accorded a social meaning through the principle of relativity. This principle applies not merely to physical measurements but to all judgments, including affirmations of truth and of righteousness. A scientist, for example, states the truth as he sees it. His statement is neither rejected on account of the relativity of its view nor accepted as absolute by the test of sincerity. It is accepted as a private view to be supplemented and perhaps corrected by other private views in a growing body of truth. Let us treat conscience in similar fashion. A private judgment concerning righteousness (or God's will) should be neither rejected nor regarded as absolute, but accepted as a relative contribution to a body of moral wisdom which is bound to increase in scope and refinement.

When compelled to make a sudden moral decision I am obliged to follow my conscience, for I have nothing better to guide me than God, expressed through my present fully organized views. But I am just as surely obliged to educate my conscience through integration with dissimilar consciences in common responsibility to God.

Trumpets on New Horizons

EDITED BY LUCIA TRENT

Dawn Comes Slowly

Slowly, so very slowly
Comes the gleam of dawn.
All the strangeness gone!
All the little lowly
Insects wake and stir
In their brown-earth beds, too,
At dawnlight's messenger.
They've many things to do.

Slowly, so very slowly
Light breaks over our sleep,
Pricks our consciousness deep.
We, the little, lowly
Things without number, creep
Down in our soul beds, too,
Stir and confess and weep . . .

Man has so much to do . . .
Before another dawn
When all dark things are gone.

IDA ELAINE JAMES.

When Shall Eternal Eden Spring to Birth?

Let the savage Goliaths keep rising as ever of old,
Trampling the Truth and the Right under blood-soaked feet,
Hushing the music the bell of hope has tolled,
Shouting the songs of death through each man-cursed street.

Let them be blind to evil, let orphans roam
Through earth like driven cattle, staring and lost
Never to hear the dashing of ocean foam,
The silver tinkle of brooks (Oh, bitter the cost!).

Blind are they to the planets' mighty swing,
To the crimson bugle of dawn in the eastern skies,
Ignoring God's hidden touch in everything
The vengeance of Him before whom all must rise.

That day when guilty and guiltless must stand to hear
The verdict read of their sojourn here on earth.
When shall the hearts of men be purged of fear,
When shall Eternal Eden spring to birth?

IRENE KIRBY SURENSON.

Erosion

Through carelessness and ignorance of man
The land becomes eroded, leaving bare
And gaunt the fertile fields of other years
Which gave abundant harvest as their share.

Eroded of the vital elements,
The precious gift of God abused and lost;
And now in war and wanton waste of life
Mankind erodes its youth at fearful cost.

DELLA ADAMS LEITNER.

Under the Curse

The foulest crimes of history
Are written down in red
On every page of solemn ground
Where hostages lie dead.

Awaiting final justice now
Beyond all fear and pain,
They are more fortunate than those
Who caused them to be slain,

Whose hands are stained with blood that time
Will never wash away,
Whose souls must bear the curse of God
Upon some judgment day.

CLAUDE WEIMER.

The Changing Vista of Religion

F. H. AMPHLETT MICKLEWRIGHT

There can be little dispute that the Christian stereotype has broken down. The evidence may be observed in several directions. The vast majority of objective scholars are unwilling to recognize in traditional Christianity any quality implying some unique revelation of final truth concerning existence and destiny. Among the population at large, life has become secularized in many directions; there is considerable unreadiness to concede certainty to claims of Divine sanction made on behalf of church or creed. The usual retort of ecclesiastics that the failure is due to such influences as those of the radio, the cheap press, the cinema, is true to some degree. But it is also true that things possessing a firm hold upon human affections are not given up easily without apparent struggle. Many have found it possible, however, to exchange churchgoing for a round of golf and have not suffered qualms of conscience as a result. Again, the churches are caught up within the existing social situation. They have abdicated from the moral leadership of the nation through an impotence to evolve any transcendent criterion of judgment which can provide the background of a distinctive Christian culture. Ecclesiastical morals have become no more than a sanctification of the more amiable contemporary ethical attitude found in society generally. The church is paying a natural penalty; its theological stereotype is unnecessary to those who already accept the conventional morality upon other grounds, while it is either irrelevant or hostile to the more progressive movements of the time.

From one point of view this ecclesiastical and theological breakdown is to be welcomed. It denotes a further step in the emancipation of the human mind. Superstition is in decay; mental torments brought about by such atrocious dogmas as that of eternal punishment are not likely to be known to many of the present generation. But there is also another aspect of the matter which does not lead to such optimistic feelings. The Christian stereotype originally denoted a symbolic form for certain innate human promptings and desires. It provided a standard of agreed moral values by which life might be assessed. The fact that it grew up within the Roman Empire and continued to take shape as a living species during the early Middle Ages gave to the Christian theology a certain inherent unity derived from St. Augustine. Its breakup had its roots in the more fundamental breakup of the Empire. As the political world split, the church was severed into East and West, and the two sections grew apart. The distinctive dogmas evolved by the later Middle Ages, such as belief in progress and in the natural man, could only beget a general skepticism with regard to the truth of the Augustinian stereotype. The shattering of Medieval Europe into conflicting fragments meant the parallel shattering of the church into several mutually antagonistic groups. Traditional theological conceptions lost their hold, but the fruit of centuries does not pass away overnight. The orthodox Christian explanation of time and eternity was a long time dying; its deathblow did not come till the work of Darwin and of nineteenth century research into religious origins permeated the public mind. The signs of collapse became apparent in the 1880's. But the passing away of supernatural religious sanctions and judgments has left a great void through their failure to retain any hold upon general allegiance in forming individual or social moral standards. Mankind, anxious to find security in some transcendent belief is apt to fill the void by evolving such pseudo-religions as Fascism or a Nazified philosophy of state loyalty and exploitation.

A primitive savage not only made his God in his own image, but also in those of the animals with which he was acquainted. Thus did totemism come about. The Yahweh of Hebraism took shape within a certain social and cultural situation. The Divine Father of Jesus represented a moral level of consciousness produced by a definite environment. So too did the triune Deity of the Catholic Church. Two facts defy ultimate rationalization. The one, to which Professor Reinhold Niebuhr has called attention, consists of the wide divergence between the high moral choices of the individual and the comparatively low morality accepted by society when acting in mass formation. The other fact is that man would seem to have some sense of the higher level and of its desirability existing innately in his moral and intellectual makeup. Humanity possesses a history providing abundant examples of individuals striving to overcome the prevailing ethical level and constantly seeking to attain higher standards in spite of the lower valuations accepted by the contemporary society.

In the widest sense of the term, religion consists in a recognition of some moral standard or ideal which provides an objective criterion of judgment by which the moral and intellectual life may be assessed and tested. The collapse of the Christian stereotype suggests that a period has been reached in which religious insight has evolved away from the particular projections of the mind which gave form to the traditional Christian conceptions. There has been a movement of thought out of supernatural into naturalistic beliefs and sanctions. From this angle religion appears as a way of life orientated in a chosen series of moral values. The depth of ethical perception will determine the quality and worth of the religion. The religious function, the shaping and guiding of the individual moral promptings to reach a higher level than conventional society concedes generally, has found a new field in which to function. It is concerned with "the here and now"; its data rest upon factual and empirical knowledge obtained through the application of scientific methods of comparison and experiment. The opposite of religion conceived in this sense is not atheism or the denial of some theological speculation but an opportunist secularity which accepts prevailing social standards and thereby fails to recognize any ethical standard beyond that brought about for the moment by personal reaction to any event which the day may bring forth.

The collapse of the Christian stereotype has produced a curious situation. The conventional churches are caught up within the social environment; they are therefore at the mercy of the moral opportunism exercising itself upon the passing events of the scene which is acceptable to man in the mass. Secularity of the worst type has thereby invaded the churches; their sanctified amiability never succeeds in achieving any standard capable of transcending the general opinion governing society. The church is powerless to reach an objective and dis-

tinctive ethical level which could focus moral opinion upon such matters as peace and war, or any matter which goes to the roots of social behavior. On the other hand, various non-supernaturalist movements have accepted a definitive philosophy by which human life may be judged as a whole and future advances planned out in terms of non-material qualities and intangible ideals. Whatever may be the truth or falsehood inherent in its propositions, Marxism affords a living example of such a creed. Many movements of the time exhibiting religious qualities are existing apart from the Churches or, in some cases, in the sharpest antagonism to them.

The general chaos of the situation suggests the need for a practical recognition of the changing vista of religion from supernaturalism to naturalism. A new integration is necessary which can provide a criterion to the varied and innate religious promptings taking definite shape in the contemporary world. Unless this end can be brought about, the acceptance of lesser deities is the most probable outcome of the Christian collapse. Individual moral quests need guidance to achieve a rationalization in some form beneficial to the whole race and not, as in Hitlerism, in some embodiment hostile to a large section of it. A new religious formulation is necessary, accepting liberality and rationality as its ethical standard and striving therefore for the general enlightenment of the human race as the only means by which mankind will learn an "art of living together" capable of overcoming the lower valuations of social ethics. The forms in which the fundamental religious promptings of individuals have been commonly disguised are so generally understood that the American Humanists are probably taking the wisest course when they look for general reinterpretation rather than blank denial. As Dr. John H. Dietrich, a leader in these circles, has pointed out, sin may be a superstition, but the reality of which the theology was a projection needs examination from a psychological and sociological angle. Questions of theism and of immortality are irrelevant for the most part to a religion concerned with the life of this world; they belong to the sphere of speculation, and not of fact. Yet, in a reinterpreted form, they call attention to the permanent value of life as a constant stream taking individual and temporary shape through an infinite number of human personalities. The conventional picture of Christ symbolizes certain moral ideals; it is the claim to historicity for the Jesus of the Gospels which has collapsed. Prayer, as Prof. Julian Huxley remarks in *Religion without Revelation,* may be a mere piece of superstitious magic when regarded as a series of mechanical petitions to a supreme despot, but it can be a highly desirable practice in the sense of an examination of personal motives and achievements judged by the highest moral standards which the individual can envisage. Certainly some integration of contemporary religious promptings into the cultural form of an ethical Humanism capable of elevating social life calls for a measure of practical reinterpretation in these matters. To achieve this integration is the most pressing religious problem of the moment. The traditional Christian stereotype of belief and practice shows every sign of passing away. It has sunk even now into a senile decay. But the instincts underlying religious forms remain implanted in man, and it is the peculiar task of the Humanist to guide them into the integration with culture and education which can be of the greatest moral and intellectual service to contemporary man as he enters into a new civilization. The present time is, in every sense, "the end of an age"; conceptions and values once regarded as generally axiomatic are now disputed generally. The moral level playing the part of a psychological matrix within which the age immediately at hand will be formed must be determined in quality by the extent to which a religion integrated to a scientific culture through an emancipation from supernaturalism can affect the situation. For this reason the securing of a humanist religious integration in the light of the highest intuitions of tolerance and reason known to mankind is the most practical contemporary moral issue.

The New "New Year"

Look up,
For the new "New Year,"
To the untouched sun
And find the *dawn* of peace
Already won!
Look up!
Sing happy new year
To the stars,
A serenade for Mars!
Chant grateful welcome
To that new year
Coming here:—
No power on earth
Can stay the mirth
Of that gay galaxy
That nightly sets a play
All enter free—
Cloud-saddened now and then
By passing wrongs of men.

We capture, with our eyes,
Blue fields of skies,—
Not with our greedy hands
To cry such havoc
As we gave our lands.
We find faith in the beauty
High up there
Which, to our capacity, alike
We share and share.
We are in the prelude
Of that new year, coming here,
With a blackout to all fear!
RIGHT, the victor,
WRONG, the vanquished;—
The *cause* will win!
A just and permanent
Prosperity
Was never based on sin.

Peace on earth,
Good will to man;—
Is there a better plan,
A stronger plea,
For you and me
To help make fields of green
As free and beautiful
And true
As fields of blue
Where none could think to mar
One star?

HELEN KIMBERLY MCELHONE.

Road to Moscow

O. A. HAMMAND

When Adolf Hitler offered his hand to Stalin in friendship and peace and signed a treaty on that 24th day of August, 1938, it was not for love. It was a marriage of convenience. Hitler knew it at the time and probably was guessing how long it would last; and it is likely that Stalin suspected the plot and thought it best to play the game and get ready for the breakup. The breakup probably came sooner than either one expected. Hitler wanted to buy time enough to whip England. To him it did not seem a difficult task. Soon all Europe had been overrun and conquered and was in his power and working for him. He knew that America would not intervene until our trade was interrupted or until we were attacked. So there was no present danger from across the Atlantic.

But he did not want to go to war with Russia at his back. In the crisis the Great Bear might wake up. So the treaty with Russia was for temporary purposes only. After England, Russia was to come next with her rich wheat fields and her rich oil fields. It was all planned nicely according to *Mein Kampf*. But England refused to surrender and it spoiled everything. England, stubborn, arbitrary and selfish, just refused to surrender. This was something different and Hitler had told his people how it was to be done. He would take England in a few weeks. His plans were all made and his map of Europe was already drawn: France was to be a peasant country and grow vegetables and make wine, and England was to be Hitler's shipyards. Norway and Sweden would produce fish, and Holland and Denmark, bacon and eggs. It was left for Germany to be the military nation, breed soldiers, and goosestep. Now the whole plan was ruined and Hitler's promises of a blitz war with an early triumphant peace and plunder, servants and food, and "no bombs on Berlin" all blew up in his face, and so he had to do something.

In the meantime when Hitler offered Stalin a share of Poland, he just accepted it; when three former provinces, Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania were once more in his hands he just kept them; and when Finland was open to attack he just went in. While Hitler was selling time he was also selling territory. Stalin was nobody's fool and did not intend to give something for nothing unless it was necessary to do so. While Hitler was preparing to invade, Stalin was preparing not to be invaded. So when England refused to surrender and Hitler was on the spot and his people impatient, he must do something to satisfy them and there was only one thing to do. It was to break his treaty and invade Russia. Not that there was any moral restraint. Morals seemed to be no part of his plans, but it was not an easy job nor a safe job to do: so the old idea of divide and conquer was again used.

After all, England might be willing to make peace. After all, England might not be so hostile as it would seem. She might forget her grievances and her bombs if offered an honorable peace. Anyhow the peace was not necessarily binding on Mr. Hitler if circumstances changed or if his fancy changed. Therefore it only remained to devise a plan that was smart and Hitler had it. He would make friends with England until he had Russia licked. Rudolf Hess was the answer. He would pack up Rudolf Hess and ship him over to England and fix it all up to have peace with England until he got Russia licked. With that accomplished he could then turn back again and lick England. Divide and conquer had worked successfully up to the present time and it could just as well work once more. Certainly England was no smarter than Austria, Czechoslovakia, Poland, Belgium, Holland, and the Scandinavian countries. But when Mr. Hess dropped into Scotland with maps and a broken ankle and demanded to talk with Winston Churchill or Anthony Eden they just put him away without any interviews. Hitler had put all of his eggs in one basket and had kicked over the basket. Now he had no choice but to break the treaty with Stalin and try to whip Russia and England at the same time.

So Adolf Hitler started on the long, long trail to Moscow over the Napoleon road. He was ready. He had been preparing for ten years. He had met with no considerable resistance on the continent and he had in his hands the goods and wealth he had stolen from the people of Europe. His hands were wet with the blood of the Czechs and the Poles. His brain was hot with the enforced praise of his conquered peoples; but it was a long, cold road to Moscow.

His munitions trains rushed toward the east. His commissaries followed in parallel lines in between. Panzer division after panzer division swept on and on to the east. The roads were cleared for the use of Hitler. City after city was seized; the people driven out and their homes and their goods and cattle stolen. The poor and the homeless were shot down or set to work, and the women were abused. On they went, over the country, from town to town and from city to city; harvesting the grain and driving out all who opposed or resisted them. The Hitler machine was in action and was fed by the conquered people. Far on ahead was heard the roar of bombing planes. The cities were alive with fire. Far in front and on all sides parachutists dropped out of the sky and turned loose their machine guns and tommy guns on men, women, and children. Far in the rear followed the long line of war and close up behind it the smirky face of Adolf Hitler. He was happy. Things seemed to be going good. "It was according to schedule." And wherever his army went, death and disease and starvation followed close at its heels. Europe, like a great giant, thrashed about in its chains; England could do nothing and America was debating the neutrality bill and sending scrap iron and oil to Japan.

The Germans had advanced for hundreds of miles over a 2,000-mile front. They had taken over millions of people in the occupied territory; they had seized one-third of the industry of Russia and captured or destroyed many industrial cities of the Pittsburgh, Detroit, or Cleveland class. They had cut off railroad supplies and rolled on through the rich fields of the Ukraine and on toward the oil of the Caucasus. But they had lost lots of blood; thousands and perhaps hundreds of thousands had died or suffered from wounds. They had advanced to a point far from their home base, where supplies and ammunitions were difficult to provide and where hospitals and ambulances could not be had. Here in this death spot, far away from home and food and ammunition and supplies, Old Man Winter came down on them like a blast out of the

Arctic. And also, dressed in furs and caps and big boots, on horseback and in trucks and tanks and on dog sleds, down came the Russian Reds. They by-passed the retreating hordes and slipped past them and far in front of them and then turned on the miserable mass of struggling Germans clad only in thin and flimsy clothes. On, faster and faster, the Russians came from the rear and pressed harder and harder on the retreating columns. The Germans fled from the occupied towns and cities. When they had time, they set fires and carried off the goods and supplies, but if too hard pressed they left them behind. All along the way, stiff frozen German arms and legs stuck up out of the snow, and dead horses were mingled with tanks and trucks and ammunition dumps. The Germans rushed on in their retreat without time to bury their dead. It was a short war, so they were told by Adolf Hitler, and they did not need warm clothes. Back home, soldiers pulled fur coats and warm clothes and shoes off the people in the streets and Hitler's slaves worked long hours to make heavy clothes and get them to the front, but it was too little and too late. Moscow and Leningrad and Stalingrad were saved and the long blitz train was driven far back toward the west, over the same old road that Napoleon had traveled long ago.

The Study Table

Handbook of Private Schools

EDUCATION IN WARTIME. *By Porter Sargent. Published by Porter Sargent,* 11 *Beacon Street, Boston.* 224 *pp.* $1.50.

Every year, for the past twenty-six years, Porter Sargent has compiled and published his remarkable Handbook of Private Schools, a survey of the educational institutions of this country made in the interest of parents and students. Long since, these handbooks have become an authority in their field. Complete in the matter of their material, absolutely impartial and independent in their attitude, they have become an annual compendium of well-nigh priceless value.

A feature of these handbooks is a report, or introductory essay, by the Editor interpreting recent activities and developments in the whole educational field of America. This report has taken on such importance and proved of such fascinating interest that it has been published in recent years as a separate volume. This year, for obvious reasons, it is called *Education in Wartime,* and reveals, like a telescope aimed at a sweeping planet, the educational theory and practice of our democracy in this chaotic hour. In essence this volume is a kind of encyclopedia of the thoughts, activities, and writings not only of professional educators but of all men and women dealing at this moment with educational phenomena. The material assembled is amazing in its completeness and variety, running all the way from school reports, articles in educational journals and popular magazines, newspaper editorials, and current addresses, to the wide range of contemporary literature as represented by Bernard De Voto, Aldous Huxley, Bernard Shaw, H. G. Wells, Lin Yu-Tang, and many others. Sounding like a theme-song through the whole are the running comments of Porter Sargent, —dry, pungent, ironical, denunciatory, always heretical, and not seldom grandly creative. Mr. Sargent has devastating thoughts about American education. The rubbish he would sweep away would fill one of the large dustbins of history. The children would never miss it, but it would be death for the trustees, teachers, and experts in our schools and colleges. Which is just what this ruthless reformer would most like!

This latest report is for obvious reasons of critical importance. A revolution is upon us, and no element of our civilization is feeling it more immediately and profoundly than our educational world. Caught between the lower millstone of a rapidly declining birth rate and the upper millstone of a war sweeping away our youthful man-power and soon woman-power into the war-effort, our private schools, colleges, and even universities are facing the problem of sheer survival. The situation becomes acute when complicated by mounting income taxes, declining endowments, and the breakup of that great American middle class which has hitherto provided the raw material of our educational institutions. Some schools have already folded up; others are adjusting themselves frighteningly to chaotic conditions; many colleges are frankly trying to save themselves by becoming military academies. Mr. Sargent has not a little fun with professors and presidents, like Conant of Harvard, who denounced Hitler for what he did to German universities and are now doing the same thing to their own! One thing is certain—our private educational institutions will never be the same again. The easygoing and playful student life, the long four-month summer vacations, the highly systematized entrance examinations, these have gone and will not return after the war is done. Only the values will remain—assuming that anything remains after this dark age. And it is Mr. Sargent's exposition of these values which is the chief glory of his book. That education shall quicken and not kill, release and not imprison, the ever new-born soul of man—this is his thesis, and the task not yet achieved.

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES.

A Growing Book

LADY GODIVA AND ST. SATYR. *By Lucia Trent and Ralph Cheyney. Las Animas, Colo.: Ben and Isabel Hagglund.* $1.00.

There is something about this book that puts it in a class by itself. Perhaps this is so because it is a "growing book," to which pages can be added by its authors, perhaps because it is the last joint volume by two of America's most beloved makers of song, perhaps because its lines are written across the bleeding heart of humanity. Lucia, the lyrical, Ralph, the vigorous,—both are protestors striving through their magical lines to secure man's rightful heritage. "Here in *Lady Godiva and St. Satyr* we meet two poets who out of their own rare integration in life and joy, fashion cosmos," says E. Merrill Root in his warmly glowing foreword, "Two Stars that Dance."

Eloquent, indeed, is Lucia Trent's "Open Letter to Robinson Jeffers" which cries out to the high heavens for social betterment and ends with a floodlight of joy in these provocative lines:

When, behold! the gauntlet of Light is boldly flung
And the world is ours—is OURS!

Tender, compassionate, limpidly lyrical, Lucia's lines flow like a quiet river of song on to the Universal Sea. At times there is a tinge of bitterness, but it is a righteous bitterness blended with loneliness that only the high-souled can experience.

The poetic utterance of the late Ralph Cheyney sparkles with vivid, quotable lines. He had a driving force, an intensity of conviction of the eventual triumph of MAN over men. Here the principles of justice advocated in the Sermon on the Mount find magnificent lyrical expression. To Ralph, all life is a spiralling adventure and Love is the sacramental wine of the ages. And—occasionally, "the glint of a . . . HOOF" flashes across his mind's eye.

Two essays of scintillating prose, one by Lucia and the other by Ralph, bring this volume to an electric conclusion. ". . . always on toward the great light," Lucia encourages the world. And Ralph injects hopefulness into the veins of humanity by his brilliant aphorism, "Men fail but man succeeds."

The cover design and frontispiece executed by Ralph Cheyney II, their twelve-year-old son, evidence the makings of an artist with a marked feeling for form and line.

The closing quatrain of "Highway Song" by Lucia Trent sums up, perhaps, the mission of these two "dancing stars" better than pages of description ever could:

For never until we have fathomed
The anguish of flesh and soul
Can we gather the titan power
To make humanity whole.

ETTA JOSEPHEAN MURFEY.

Memorable Poems

A WITNESS TREE. *By Robert Frost. New York: Henry Holt & Co. 91 pp. $2.00.*

Robert Frost has been writing a good many years now. This is his seventh volume of poetry. His books have not been rushed—there are long intervals between publication! *A Witness Tree* is his first book in six years. Nor does Frost hurry his poems from his desk to the printer's office. There is one piece in this volume which is dated "circa 1900." Other pieces, of course, are more recent. But this poet is no daily rhymester. He is a genius who has a profound reverence for his art, and has therewith earned the commanding and permanent place which he has long since won in our American literature.

The first question, perhaps, which springs to mind as one opens this latest of Robert Frost's volumes is the question as to whether this distinguished poet is as good as he used to be. The answer is easy. He is! Not as fresh, perhaps, for we have learned now to recognize that strange mingling of wisdom, beauty, and sheer love of nature which makes Frost himself and no one else. In the beginning of Frost's work there was the excitement of discovery and novelty. Now there is the comfort and charm of familiarity. But the writing is as wonderful as ever, and the pieces as memorable. This volume, like Frost's earlier volumes, contains poems which are easily recognizable as sure of immortality.

"Come In," for example!—I would rank this among Frost's greatest nature-pieces. Distilled in this one poem is everything that has made its author so distinctive a figure in our literature. To this I would add at once "The Quest of the Purple-Fringed," which is almost uncanny in its perfection of feeling and utterance. Then there is "Trespass," and "A Nature Note," and others which are supreme examples of the Frost *genre,* if I may call it such.

But Robert Frost is profound as well as lovely. He plumbs deep, and brings up what makes him a philosopher as well as poet. Take "The Gift Outright," already so widely quoted as to be familiar:

"The land was ours before we were the land's!"

The whole spiritual history of the settlement of the American continent is in these sixteen flawless lines. "Happiness Makes Up in Height for What It Lacks in Length" is breath-taking not only in its beauty but in its vast sweep and range of thought. Nor is this wisdom only wisdom! It is salted with wit—see "A Considerable Speck;" and touched with pity—see "The Rabbit Hunter." Here is a great person as well as a great poet.

There are other poems in this volume. A narrative poem, "The Discovery of the Madeiras," seems to me to be beautifully done. The Harvard Phi Beta Kappa Poem (1941) is genial and timely. A set of couplets, quatrains, and similarly brief pieces, called "Quantula," seem to be not exactly in Robert Frost's vein. Here he is striving for something he does not quite bring off. But every poet is entitled to occasional lapses. In all that is essential, in the true and characteristic vein, Frost is as great as ever. Of what man in all our literature today should we be so proud as he?

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES.

The Vision of the Oneness

All things are of the Oneness wrought,
Their every part a form of thought.
One Spirit in each atom lives
And to all being beauty gives.

There is the Oneness everywhere,
In its completeness do we share—
In everything one mind, one heart,
Nor can we live from it apart.

To know that we to it belong
Is truly to be wise and strong.
Unbroken by life's toil and pain
The heights of joy do we attain.

What rapture that we can rehearse
The beauty of the universe;
Its oneness ever satisfies
Whatever need within us lies.

VICTOR E. SOUTHWORTH.